as the confederation had been found not to fulfil its intended objects. It was proposed, therefore, to erect a new, common, government, which should possess certain definite powers, such as regarded the prosperity of the people of all the States; and to be formed upon the general model of American Constitutions."

will be pointed at the men who deserted their posts in the hour of trial, and left their seats in Congress to uphold the foul flag of treason. My friend from Somerset (Mr. Dennis) has made the admission—an unfortunate one for him—that when he was a Bell and Everett elector, when he was advocating those principles upon which was founded the very tem-

Those men who framed this Constitution, to whom all succeeding ages, as well as ours, owe an everlasting debt of gratitude, foresaw that it would be impossible to keep this nation together as one indivisible, indissoluble whole, unless the States gave up a part of their State sovereignty, and made the General Government supreme. They knew that a Constitution and laws affecting a vast amount of territory, could not apply with equal justice to all; and they knew that if it was possible for one State to disregard the bonds which united these people together in one solid whole, all their labors would be in vain, their hopes blighted, and the government would be nothing but Dead Sea fruit when you came to enjoy it, turning to ashes on the lips.

So that from all the authorities-and they are innumerable-I take it that there cannot be such a thing as State sovereignty in conflict with the Government authority. it was prohibited to the States to enter into treaties, to carry on commerce, to coin money, to estimate and fix its value, to unite in any alliance with any other State, that established the fact that they could not be sovereign. The very proposition was absurd on its very face, ex vi termini, of a sovereign exercising its functions and its rights, only with the consent or by the bidding of some other power. Can a State make treaties? Can a State keep a navy or an army? Can a State coin money? Can a State collect revenue by duties without the consent of Congress?

The idea of consolidation, it seems to me, is a mere chimera and delusion. It was so pronounced by Mr. Madison, the author of the celebrated resolutions of Virginia, in 1788; and Mr. Madison replied to Patrick Henry, and said there was no danger of such consolidation, because the interests of the government, the prosperity of the government, and the welfare of the government, were dependent upon the welfare of the States; and there would be such a community of interest between the State and General Government that there would never be any oppression of the States by the General Government.

Besides that, there was an appeal to be made. The Supreme Court of the United States is the arbiter to decide such questions. Amendments to the Constitution can be proposed. The people at the ballot box have the right to change their rulers. They have the right to plan the policy of the government. Various different ways are provided by which the hand of oppression can be stayed. And by all succeeding generations, the finger of eternal scorn

posts in the hour of trial, and left their seats in Congress to uphold the foul flag of treason. My friend from Somerset (Mr. Dennis) has made the admission—an unfortunate one for him-that when he was a Bell and Everett elector, when he was advocating those principles upon which was founded the very temple of our government: "The Union, the Constitution, and the Enforcement of the Laws," he would have voted for Mr. Breckinridge in order tohave prevented the election of Mr. Lincoln. Was not Breckinridge as sectional a candidate as Lincoln? Does any one suppose that his nomination had any other object than to defeat the election of Douglas, and thus aid Lincoln's election to the Presidency? And when Mr. Lincoln was elected by the exercise of the same privilege which had elevated to the Presidential chair, Washington, Adams, and every one of the Presidents down to 1860, the power of the government was in the hands of the Democracy, a name which has done more harm, a party which has perpetrated more wrongs than any other which has ever existed in this or in any other land, in my best and candid opinion.

Mr. Lincoln was in the Presidential chair, but tied up and restrained by all manner of bonds. The Senate was against him; the House was against him; the Supreme Court was against him. He could not, if he had desired it, have moved hand or foot in the invasion of any of the rights of the South; for he was checkmated upon all sides by the Democratic party.

But this scheme had been going on for long years. It was started by Mr. Calhoun; but the strong arm of Andrew Jackson then nipped treason in the bud. It was still unquenched, and the fires burned concealed, until a pretext was afforded by the election of Lincoln, a sectional candidate against a sectional candidate, when Democracy had lost its power to reign. If Democracy could have been clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day, and could have monopolized all the offices of the government. there never would have been sufficient cause to break up the Union, but all would have come in under Douglas or Breckinridge, and shouted hosanna to the Union, just so long as they could have made it subservient

to their purposes. [Applause] But what have they done? They started this rebellion, and the institution in whose interest they professed to be acting, has received its death-blow. They started a confederacy, a nation founded on slavery, which never had an existence with the consent of the North, except under and by the Constitution. Although it was opposed to the moral sentiment of the North, yet there were a large majority that were ready to uphold it because it was recognized by the Constitution. Even